

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

KENNETH VENTRELLA,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

TRUMP RUFFIN TOWER I, LLC, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:12-cv-01450-LRH-NJK

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST  
TO EXTEND DISCOVERY  
DEADLINES (Docket No. 46)**

Pending before the Court appears to be a stipulation to extend discovery deadlines, *see* Docket No. 46 (“Second Amended Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order”), which is hereby **DENIED**. The pending request has a number of deficiencies. First, a request to extend discovery deadlines shall be made by motion or stipulation. *See* Local Rule 26-4; *see also* Docket No. 30. The pending request is fashioned as a discovery plan. Second, requests for extension must be supported by a showing of good cause if filed more than 21 days before the expiration of the subject deadline, and by a showing of excusable neglect if filed less than 21 days before the expiration of the subject deadline. Local Rule 26-4; *see also* Docket No. 30. The pending request does not attempt to make such a showing.<sup>1</sup> Third, “[a]ny motion or stipulation to extend a deadline or to reopen discovery shall include[, *inter alia*,]: (a) A statement specifying the discovery completed; (b) A specific description of the discovery that remains to be completed; [and] (c) The reasons why the deadline was not satisfied or the remaining discovery was not completed within the time limits set by the discovery plan.” Local Rule 26-4; *see also* Docket No. 30. The pending request fails to do so.

<sup>1</sup> The pending request also misstates Local Rule 26-4's timing requirements for requesting an extension of discovery deadlines. *See* Docket No. 46 at 4.

1 The Court has already specifically reminded counsel of the above requirements. *See* Docket  
2 No. 30. Nonetheless, counsel failed to take heed of these instructions. Counsel are again reminded  
3 of these requirements and are hereby ORDERED to file any future requests for discovery-related  
4 extensions in accordance with the requirements outlined above and in the Local Rules. Future  
5 failure to abide by this Order or the Local Rules may result in the imposition of sanctions.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: March 11, 2013

8  
9   
10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 NANCY J. KOPPE  
12 United States Magistrate Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28